DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 090 24 EA 002 701

TITLE	Summer (1968) Institute on Evaluation, University of Illinois. Supplemental Report.
INSTITUTION	Cooperative Educational Research Lab., Inc., Northfield, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE).; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-6-1391
PUB DATE	Aug 69
CONTRACT	OEG-3-7-061391-3061
NOTE	52p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.70
DESCRIPTORS	Achievement Tests, Attitude Tests, Background, *Evaluation, Evaluation Needs, Item Analysis, *Measurement Instruments, Program Evaluation, *Program Improvement, *Summer Institutes, *Trainees

ABSTRACT

This report describes an attempt to revise and pilot-test an achievement quiz, a background information form, and an attitude inventory considered inadequate when used at the Summer (1968) Institute on Evaluation at the University of Illinois. In the original achievement quiz, most items tested recall or information and few tested the student's ability to comprehend. In the revision, items were written at a transformation or evaluation level. Based on a field test at Loyola University, an item analysis of the data indicated an improvement. The revised background information form was constructed to be more selective among applicants and thereby to improve future institutes. Both a second and third edition of the attitude inventory were tested in a field sample of 29 Loyola students to determine the relationship of the inventory's factors to the individual's performance on the achievement quiz and his background information form. The overall objective of the institute was to develop a climate among educators supportive of evaluation. (LN)

KA

ED035090

BR6-1391
PA-24
OE/BR

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT:

Summer (1968) Institute on Evaluation

University of Illinois

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Sponsored by:

Cooperative Educational Research Laboratory, Inc.
Northfield, Illinois

Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
University of Illinois (Urbana)

Supported by:

Department of Program Development for Gifted Youth
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
State of Illinois

EA 002 701

Cooperative Educational Research Laboratory, Inc.

August, 1969

ED035090

CONTENTS

Statement of Focus 1

I REVISION of INSTRUMENTS

A. The Achievement Quiz 2

Table 1 "Results of evaluation Experts' Scoring". 5

Table 2 "Item Analysis of Achievement Quiz Data" 7

B. Background Information Form 9

C. Attitude Inventory 10

Table 3 "Number of Students Passing the Items". 19

II ACHIEVEMENT OF PROGRAM'S GOALS

A. Affective Domain Objectives 20

B. CERLI Staff's Evaluation 21

APPENDIXES

A- Achievement Quiz

B- Background Information Form

C- Curriculum Components

D- Staff or Faculty Component

E- Evaluation Component

STATEMENT of FOCUS

This supplemental report describes an attempt to:

revise and pilot-test three instruments*
considered inadequate when used at the
Summer Institute on Evaluation (1968)

and

clarify the program's objectives, data, continuity
by constructing and superimposing an evaluation
model or schema on CERLI's Report of the 1968
Summer Institute on Evaluation, University of
Illinois, July 29 - August 9, 1968 (October, 1968).

*Achievement Quiz, Background Information Form,
Attitude Inventory

August, 1969

I. REVISION of INSTRUMENTS

A. The Achievement Quiz

Analysis of the original achievement test revealed that 12 (among 31) items were within the acceptable difficulty and discrimination range. In the revised instrument, these "good" items were included among 50 items testing the following aspects of evaluation and distributed according to the following ratios:

Experimental design	- 16%	Data analysis	- 4%
Evaluation model	- 14%	Educational process	- 4%
Objectives	- 8%	Standards	- 4%
Statistics	- 8%	Imput data	- 4%
Variables	- 8%	Interviewing	- 2%
Data collection	- 6%	Norms	- 2%
Instrument development	6%	References	- 2%
Judgments	- 6%	Samples	- 2%
Outcomes	- 6%		

In the original quiz, most items tested recall or information and appreciably little of the student's ability to comprehend. In the revised quiz, items were written at a transformation or evaluation level and for the most part dealt with the performance objectives cited in the original report:

It was expected that each participant would--

Design components of an evaluation plan for local use

Make a table of contents for a summative evaluation report of his own local gifted program

Improve his facility for using the language and concepts of measurement and evaluation

Prepare to try out certain standardized classroom observation techniques that con be useful in evaluation studies

Examine prototyp evaluation reports and read selections from the literature on evaluation

Work out solutions to a series of problems designed to simulate the conditions and circumstances of local gifted projects in Illinois

In order to involve the student in a task simulating what an evaluator actually would be expected to experience and perform, the testwriter constructed items related to evaluating the objectives, outcomes, experimental design, instruments used, etc. of a proposal submitted by a participant in the Evaluation Institute at Urbana. (See Appendix A-Achievement Quiz.)

Two techniques were used to evaluate the revised version of the Achievement Quiz. Twenty-nine graduate students in educational psychology at Loyola University (Chicago) during the spring semester (1969) comprised the field test sample. Three evaluation experts (directly involved with evaluation at CERLI) took the quiz to discover items of disagreement.

Based on the field test at Loyola, an item analysis of the data indicated that 14 items were within approximate acceptable limits (difficulty .50; discrimination .30, plus range) and 13

items could easily be improved to come within acceptable limits. (See Table 2.) However, the criterion used here for the item analysis was the total test score which formed a high-scoring and low-scoring criterion group. Better criteria could be investigated. The remaining 33 poor items will be retained in the test until another sample can be found or until the post-test is administered to the field test sample.

The reliability of the test based on the pre-test data collected at Loyola University was .31. This is a split half reliability coefficient that can be increased to a reliability of .47 for the whole test when based on the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula. Correlations were also calculated between the achievement quiz, the background information data sheet and the attitude inventory.

If two out of the three experts accepted a particular statement, the item was retained in the revised achievement quiz. (See Table 1.) The only exceptions to this rule were items 22 and 23, where the view of the testwriter was considered to be the correct one. If there was a three-way disagreement on an item, the item was subject to later revision. Items 14, 25 and 28 needed to be revised.

On 29 items, there was complete agreement among the three expert evaluators. On 17 items, there were two experts in agreement (although on two items the exceptional response was retained) and three items had a three-way disagreement and were revised.

TABLE]

RESULTS OF EVALUATION EXPERTS' SCORING

	Expert I	Expert II	Expert III	Summary Key
1.	2	2	4	2
2.	2	2	2	2
3.	4	4	3	4
4.	4	4	4	4
5.	4	4	4	4
6.	2	2	2	2
7.	1	1	-	1
8.	1	1	4	1
9.	2	2	-	2
10.	1	1	2	1
11.	1	1	1	1
12.	4	4	1	4
13.	4	4	4	4
14.	1	4	2	Revised, 1
15.	2	2	2	2
16.	1	1	1	1
17.	1	1	1	1
18.	2	4	2	2
19.	1	1	1	1
20.	1	2	1	1
21.	2	2	2	2
22.	3	4	4	Accept 3
23.	1	2	2	Accept 1
24.	3	3	3	3
25.	1	3	-	Revised, 1
26.	4	4	4	4
27.	3	3	-	3
28.	2	1	3	Revised, 2
29.	2	2	2	2
30.	3	4	3	3
31.	4	3	4	4
32.	2	2	2	2
33.	2	2	2	2
34.	2	2	2	2
35.	2	2	2	2
36.	1	1	1	1
37.	4	4	4	4
38.	4	4	4	4
39.	2	2	2	2
40.	3	3	3	3
41.	4	4	4	4
42.	4	2	4	4
43.	3	3	3	3

TABLE 1 (continued)

RESULTS OF EVALUATION EXPERTS' SCORING

	Expert I	Expert II	Expert III	Summary Key
44.	4	4	4	4
45.	4	4	4	4
46.	2	2	2	2
47.	2	2	-	2
48.	2	3	3	3
49.	4	4	2	4
50.	1	1	1	1

TABLE 2

ITEM ANALYSIS OF THE ACHIEVEMENT QUIZ DATA
(N = 24)

Mean = 20.8 Standard Deviation = 4.2

	Discrimination	Difficulty	Acceptable Limits	Easily Improved
1.	.24	.52	X	
2.	.08	.36		
3.	.16	.64		
4.	.16	.24		X
5.	.08	.44		
6.	.00	.24		
7.	.00	.24		
8.	.24	.44	X	
9.	.24	.52	X	
10.	-.08	.20		
11.	.16	.16		X
12.	.32	.80		X
13.	.40	.52	X	
14.	.40	.44	X	
15.	.08	.12		
16.	.08	.68		
17.	.24	.44	X	
18.	.08	.52		
19.	.48	.64	X	
20.	-.08	.04		
21.	.24	.44	X	
22.	.08	.04		
23.	.32	.48	X	
24.	.24	.28		X
25.	.00	.08		
26.	.16	.24		X
27.	.16	.24		X
28.	.00	.08		
29.	.32	.16		X
30.	-.08	.44		
31.	.32	.44	X	
32.	.08	.20		
33.	.16	.72		X
34.	.08	.76		
35.	.24	.76	X	
36.	.16	.56		X
37.	.08	.44		
38.	-.08	.36		
39.	.00	.32		
40.	.00	.56		
41.	.32	.56	X	
42.	.48	.48	X	

TABLE 2 (continued)

ITEM ANALYSIS OF THE ACHIEVEMENT QUIZ DATA
(N = 24)

Mean = 20.8 Standard Deviation = 4.2

	Discrimination	Difficulty	Acceptable Limits	Easily Improved
43.	.16	.48		X
44.	.32	.40	X	
45.	.00	.56		
46.	.00	.72		
47.	.16	.32		X
48.	.24	.20		
49.	.16	.56		X
50.	.24	.84		X

B. Background Information Form

The Background Information Form (See Appendix B) was designed to collect data useful in grouping participants in the program and to identify numerous variables that could be used in making predictions about participants in a similar evaluation institute.

At the 1968 summer institute on evaluation (Urbana), the existence of two somewhat incompatible groups of participants created problems in communication and professional and personal relationships. The fact that some participants had an extensive background in statistics and others lacked this experience could account for the dissonance. The fact that the total group included both administrators and classroom teachers also polarized the trainees' interests and participation.

The original application form for the summer workshop in evaluation provided only routine information and very brief responses to the following questions:

> *Please describe, briefly, your previous research training and experience*
>
> *Please describe any evaluation efforts you are currently engaged in*
>
> *Will you be in a position next year to do some kind of evaluation of your district's gifted program?*

The Background Information Form has been constructed to procure information about the participant's educational background, professional development, and familiarity with evaluation terms and concepts. Thus, the form may achieve

more selectivity among applicants and a more meaningful institute.

The final question (#20) in the form lists 80 statistical, measurement and evaluation items about which the applicant indicates his degree of understanding. These responses reflect the level of each student and thus educational experiences complementing the participants' development and experiences can be planned. Even though asking students to rate their level of understanding is subject to much error, the data can be scored and subsequently correlated with other data as well as used in structuring the institute.

The graduate students who had "taken" the Achievement Quiz also comprised the sample for field-testing the Background Information Form. Of particular significance were their scores on item #20 that could subsequently be correlated with performance on the Achievement Quiz and the Attitude Inventory. Students who had completed one full course in Statistics and Tests and Measurements (indicated in their responses to items 8 and 10) were able to score higher in judging their level of familiarity and understanding of the terms and phrases.

C. Attitude Inventory

The second edition of Stake's Attitude Inventory was administered to the 29 "field sample" Loyola students in order to determine if the total inventory score or the

inventory's factors (identified by the Center for Instruction, Research and Curriculum Evaluation-CIRCE at Urbana) could be compared with their performance on the Achievement Quiz and the Background Information Form.

Three of CERLI's evaluation experts also were asked to complete the attitude inventory to provide a basis of comparison and indication of the goodness of the item. CIRCE supplied the scoring key.

The items in the Attitude Inventory and comparative data showing the respective distribution of scores are presented in the following text:

1. "The evaluator of an educational program should identify unanticipated outcomes as well as anticipated outcomes."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	73%	17%	10%
CERLI	100%	0%	0
CIRCE Key	X		

2. "It is important for the program evaluator to find out how well various people like the program."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	86%	14%	0
CERLI	100%	0	0
CIRCE Key	X		

3. "Generally speaking, a program should be evaluated with reference to one or more 'control' programs."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	76%	21%	3%
CERLI	67%	33%	0
CIRCE Key	X		

4. "The evaluator should accept the responsibility of finding the strongest, most defensible, and publicly attractive points of the program."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	55%	45%	0
CERLI	0	100%	0
CIRCE Key		X	

5. "In evaluating a program, it is at least as important to study and report on the types of teaching as it is to study and report on the amount of learning."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	83%	10%	1%
CERLI	100%	0	0
CIRCE Key	X		

6. "The evaluator should draw a conclusion as to whether or not the goals of the program are worthwhile."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	69%	28%	3%
CERLI	100%	0	0
CIRCE Key	X		

7. "It is more important to evaluate a program in comparison to what other programs do than to evaluate it with reference to what its objectives say it should do."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	14%	86%	0
CERLI	0	100%	0
CIRCE Key		X	

8. "The proper attitude for the evaluator is one of skepticism."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	28%	69%	3%
CERLI	33%	67%	0
CIRCE Key		X	

9. "The task of putting the objectives into writing is more the task of the evaluator than that of the educator."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	21%	72%	7%
CERLI	100%	0	0
CIRCE Key	X		

10. "It is essential that the full array of educational objectives be stated before the program begins."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	79%	21%	0
CERLI	0	100%	0
CIRCE Key		X	

11. "As a rule, an educator should inform students as to the objectives of the training."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	90%	7%	3%
CERLI	100%	0%	0
CIRCE Key	X		

12. "The major purpose of educational evaluation is to describe what specifically is happening."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	48%	52%	0
CERLI	67%	33%	0
CIRCE Key		X	

13. "At the present time education has more of a technical and mechanistic orientation than it should have."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	66%	21%	13%
CERLI	33%	67%	0
CIRCE Key		X	

14. "The job of an evaluator is mostly one of finding out how well students learn what they are supposed to learn."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	69%	28%	3%
CERLI	33%	67%	0
CIRCE Key	X		

15. "An educator should be encouraged to revise his objectives throughout the training period."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	59%	34%	7%
CERLI	67%	33%	0
CIRCE Key	X		

16. "The process of decision-making is one of the weakest links in the present operation of the schools."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	59%	21%	20%
CERLI	100%	0	0
CIRCE Key	X		

17. "Educators have important aims that cannot be stated adequately by anyone in terms of student behaviors."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	31%	59%	10%
CERLI	100%	0	0
CIRCE Key	X		

18. "The entire school day and the entire school experience should be divided up and assigned to the pursuit of stated educational goals."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	41%	52%	7%
CERLI	100%	0	0
CIRCE Key	X		

19. "The first job in instruction is the formulation of a statement of objectives."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	79%	21%	0
CERLI	67%	33%	0
CIRCE Key	X		

20. "A teacher should tell his students any and all of his teaching objectives."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	38%	59%	3%
CERLI	67%	33%	0
CIRCE Key		X	

21. "The major purpose of educational evaluation is to find out the worth of what is happening."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	76%	17%	7%
CERLI	100%	0	0
CIRCE Key	X		

22. "The evaluator should be a facilitator more than a critic or reformer or scholar."

	Agreed	Disagree	No Response
Students	62%	38%	0
CERLI	100%	0	0
CIRCE Key	X		

23. "To expose students to something and to arrange a particular experience for students are respectable educational goals, needing no specification as to the effects they will have on the students."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	24%	72%	4%
CERLI	33%	67%	0
CIRCE Key	X		

24. "Evaluation requires an understanding of what the conditions were before the treatment began."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	100%	0	0
CERLI	100%	0	0
CIRCE Key	X		

25. "An educator should be encouraged to conceive of his objectives in terms of how student behavior will be altered."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	83%	14%	3
CERLI	100%	0	0
CIRCE Key	X		

26. "The main purpose of evaluation is to gain understanding of how things work."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	41%	48%	11%
CERLI	33%	67%	0
CIRCE Key	X		

27. "Description and value judgment are equally important components of evaluation."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	69%	28%	3%
CERLI	100%	0	0
CIRCE Key	X		

28. "In conducting an evaluation, there is no justification for the exercise of subjective judgment of any kind by the evaluator."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	28%	66%	6%
CERLI	0	100%	0%
CIRCE Key		X	

29. "An evaluation of an education program should include a critical analysis of the value of the goals of the program."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	90%	10%	0%
CERLI	100%	0%	0%
CIRCE Key	X		

30. "The strategy of evaluation should be chosen primarily in terms of the particular needs the sponsors have for evaluation data."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	55%	35%	10%
CERLI	67%	33%	0%
CIRCE Key		X	

31. "The educational evaluator should attempt to conceal all of his personal judgment of the worth of the program he is evaluating."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	31%	69%	0%
CERLI	33%	67%	0%
CIRCE Key		X	

32. "The sponsor of an evaluation should have the final say-so in choosing or eliminating variables to be studied."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	14%	72%	14%
CERLI	0	100%	0%
CIRCE Key		X	

33. "An evaluator should concentrate on gathering data about the costs and benefits of the program."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	35%	59%	6%
CERLI	33%	67%	0%
CIRCE Key		X	

34. "Cognitive goals are more important in education than affective goals."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	28%	59%	13%
CERLI	33%	67%	0%
CIRCE Key		X	

35. "An evaluator finds it almost impossible to do his job without intruding upon the operation of the program at least a little."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	66%	28%	6%
CERLI	67%	33%	0%
CIRCE Key	X		

36. "All important educational aims can be expressed in terms of student behaviors."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	41%	55%	4%
CERLI	0%	100%	0%
CIRCE Key	X		

37. "Some educational goals are best expressed in terms of teacher behaviors."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	59%	35%	6%
CERLI	67%	33%	0%
CIRCE Key		X	

38. "The principal purpose of evaluation is to test out the theories and hypotheses."

	Agree	Disagree	No Response
Students	62%	35%	3%
CERLI	0%	100%	0%
CIRCE Key		X	

The Attitude Inventory administered to the Loyola students contained only two items similar enough to items in the inventory used with summer institute participants to warrant comparison. (Though many ideas were incorporated in the second edition, none of the original items in the first edition of the inventory was retained verbatim.)

For example.

First Edition, Item Number Two: "The evaluator should determine whether the goals of a program are worthwhile."

Second Edition, Item Number Six: "The evaluator should draw a conclusion as to whether or not the goals of the program are worthwhile."

	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
Urbana Participants - Pre-test	50%	38%	12%
Field Test Participants	69%	28%	3%
Key	X		

First Edition, Item Number Seventeen: "It is up to the local educator to rule out the study of a variable because it is not one of his objectives."

Second Edition, Item Number Thirty-Two: "The sponsor of an evaluation should have the final say-so in choosing or eliminating variables to be studied."

	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
Urbana Participants - Pre-test	4%	77%	19%
Field Test Participants	14%	72%	14%
Key		X	

In lieu of factor analyzing the second edition, a third edition of the inventory was developed and factor analyzed. (Some items in the second dition were deleted, some were rephrased, some items were added.)

There was some disagreement between the CERLI experts and the CIRCE Key obtained from Urbana. The three CERLI experts agreed with the key on 21 items; two out of three experts agreed with the key on nine items; and on the remaining eight items, two-thirds of the experts disagreed with the key on seven of the eight items (12, 14, 20, 23, 26, 30 and 37); and all experts disagreed with the key on the remaining item (36). However, items 30, 36 and 37 appear on at least two of the scales in the

attitude scale of the CIRCE third edition attitude inventory with both the Agree and Disagree responses accepted.

The following table shows the range of agreement of the 29 educational psychology students on the 3 items. CIRCE's Key was used for scoring

Table 3

Number of students passing the items

No. of Students (out of 29)	Number of Items
25-29/29	5
20-24/29	13
15-19/29	9
	27
10-14/29	7
5- 9/29	4
	38

On 27 of the 38 items, over fifty per cent of the graduate educational psychology students agreed with the key. This would seem rather high when one considers that the concepts of evaluation were relatively new to most of the student participants using the Urbana key, the range was from nineteen to twenty-eight passed with a mean of twenty-two-point-five (22.5) and a standard deviation of four-point-nine (4.9). Unfortunately, it is difficult to compare the results of the second edition with the first edition administered at Urbana, but the pre-attitudes of the graduate educational psychology students seem to be quite favorably disposed toward evaluation concepts, although this is only a guess since no comparative group exists.

Among the 29 "field-sample" studenst, fifteen volunteers completed the set of instruments and a calculation of their scores indicated the following correlation coefficients between the various revised instruments:

	Achievement Quiz	Attitude Inventory
Background Information	.18	.10
Achievement Quiz		.34

II. ACHIEVEMENT of PROGRAM'S GOALS

A. Affective Domain Objectives

To elicit the CERLI staff's judgment concerning the achievement of the program's goals, a scheme encompassing the institute's curriculum, faculty and staff, and evaluation instruments was devised. (This plan was predicted on a schema developed by Chester S. Williams, "Preparing Teachers for the Disadvantaged: A Pre-Service Program Built on Hunches", Contemporary Education, 39:5, March, 1968, pp.191-197.)

Because the summer institute's stated objectives (stimulus and performance) had not included the affective domain, the following were developed and superimposed:

to develop an awareness of the important contribution evaluation makes to the educational endeavor

to accept the evaluator role as one which assists educators rather than hinders them

to want to assist in the further development of the field of educational evaluation

to discuss evaluation and become more interested in the field

to develop a climate among educators that is supportive of evaluation

to assume a leadership role in the local educational setting

to overcome any mental blocks against evaluation

to enable the trainees to accept the ambivalent feelings encountered

to view evaluation as a helping kind of relationship in the educational process

to develop a professional relationship with evaluation agencies on a local, state and federal leve, and

to try.

Among the five CERLI staff members who had attended and observed the Institute at Urbana, only two completed and returned the forms that they had been asked to fill out. (See Appendix: C- Curriculum Component.) The three who did not respond thought they could not validly judge the institute some six months later (March, 1969). Another staff member considered "ranking" a meaningless measure of curriculum and "positioning" the staff or faculty "impossible".

B. CERLI Staff's Evaluation

The fifth staff member (the Project Manager at CERLI and director of the summer institute) submitted the following critique of the post-institute evaluation instrument:

> *Although this type of evlauation instrument would have some merit in the evaluation of another program, it is true that the length of time between the Institute and the administration of the forms to the staff was such that it would be difficult for one to complete. The format does show promise for future use, however.*

The project manager's evaluation of components for achieving most of the objectives included:

Curriculum:

Stake's Evaluation Model; Role Playing;
Model Plans; Development of Model Plans

Staff or Faculty:

Douglas Sjogren-Assistant Director,
Human Factors Research Laboratory
Colorado State University (Fort Collins)

Robert Stake-Associate Director,
CIRCE, University of Illinois

Evaluation Instruments:

Participant Critique Forms, Evaluation Plans,
Attitude Survey, Opinionnaire

APPENDIXES:

Appendix A: *Achievement Quiz*

Appendix B: *Background Information Form*

Appendix C: *Curriculum Components*

Appendix D: *Staff or Faculty Component*

Appendix E: *Evaluation Component*

APPENDIX A: ACHIEVEMENT QUIZ

Directions: Please read the following research proposal and answer the fifty multiple-choice items that follow. These items are concerned for the most part with an evaluation of the proposal in terms of the proposal's objectives, outcomes, experimental design, instruments used, etc. Respond to the items as if you were in charge of the evaluation phase of the proposal and were responsible for giving some direction to the project director before the program commences.

EVALUATION PLAN FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY

Rationale:

The academically talented child readily learns and retains information. By his very nature he constantly is seeking new challenges to his thinking and creativity. Often, however, there is limited opportunity for him to apply the skills and information he has acquired in a way which is meaningful and rewarding to him. Thus, the need to establish an atmosphere which allows the child the freedom of alternatives and the opportunity for self-initiated activities becomes mandatory. With these facts in mind, the traditional concept of the school's role in directing the student's efforts must be modified.

We are, therefore, faced with determining the kind of educational environment that will allow our intellectually superior children to use their talents to the greatest efficiency so that they can grow up to be effective, contributing members of our society.

Intended Antecedent:

This project will involve an experimental and control group of intellectually superior sixth graders from the Junior High School. The students have been identified according to their scores on Large Thorndike Intelligence.

The experimental and control groups will consist of ten students per group. They will be randomly selected from the top ten per cent of the gifted class as determined by their IQ score. The final determinant will be their expressed willingness to participate in the experimental study and parental support of the undertaking.

Intended Transactions:

This project will extend over a three year period beginning in September, 1968 and terminating in June, 1971.

The students selected for participation in the experimental group will be scheduled into accelerated classes as will those in the control group. Objective data, not included in the identification program, will be gathered at this time. In addition, data of a subjective nature will be collected.

Such things as attitude toward school teachers, classes, classmates and assignments will be noted along with noticeable strengths and weaknesses in self-initiative, self-discipline and independence.

During these first weeks, the Project Director will be establishing the groundwork for a smooth transition from the existing program to the modified program for both students and classroom teachers. Interested teachers, the principal and the guidance counselor will be invited to serve with the Project Director in an advisory capacity. In addition, the Project Director will have contacted the parents of eligible students to explain the proposed program and enlist their support.

After involvement in assigned classes for approximately one month, the experimental group will meet with the Project Director and the Interdisciplinary Team who will provide an orientation to the proposed program and indicate the range of options to which the student will be entitled. Every effort will be made to encourage a trusting relationship between the students and the Team. The student association with these staff members should not be threatening. The students should look upon them as resource people and guides in the process of educational decision-making.

After the orientation session, the experimental group will meet with the team to consider the following:

1. The role of the school
2. Educational objectives
3. Diagnosed strengths and weaknesses
4. Areas of interest and needs

At this point, each child in the experimental group will be given the option to determine:

1. Which classes to attend
2. What assignments to pursue
3. How to use time away from class
4. Where to spend time away from class
5. With whom to spend time away from class

The Project Director will be available to assist the students and consult with the students at all times. Members of the Team will also be available upon request.

As part of the developmental sequence of the program, the students' initial options will be very limited. The progress of each child in adjusting to these will determine the point at which additional options providing for greater independence will be introduced.

Intended Outcomes:

This program has been designed to provide the School System with data which will indicate the appropriateness of a program of this nature for the gifted junior high population.

We hope to show that:

1. Given the freedom in which to operate, the intellectually superior child will eventually become a more productive individual.

2. He will learn to make educational decisions and evaluate the consequences for these decisions in an environment where guidance is readily available.

3. Involvement in this program will not adversely affect achievement; instead, the child will apply his skills and information in a way which is more meaningful and rewarding to him.

4. Teachers will re-evaluate their role with greater emphasis on the real needs of these students.

Evaluation Procedure:

RO X O
1 2

RO O
1 2

This study will consist of two groups of ten children who will be selected on a random basis from the top ten per cent of the sixth grade class, determined by their scores on the Lorge Thorndike Group Intelligence test.

O X O O X O O X O O X O O X O
1 2 3 4 5

A pre and post test on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills will be administered at the beginning and end of the school year as a measure of achievement. Additional pre and post scores from other junior high gifted programs will be analyzed to see if this program has affected a change in achievement compared to other sixth grades in addition to determining any significant change between the two groups of ten in the experimental program.

A measure of self-direction will be developed to aid in identifying those children who display characteristics which seem to their ability to perform in an independent study program. If time permits, Suchman, Inquiry Training and Critical Thinking will be administered during the year to determine whether a positive correlation between self-direction and these measures exists. It is hoped that by gathering as much data as possible, we will know more about this illusive quality of self-reliance, be better able to identify it and begin to know what will help children develop in this capacity.

Cumulative record information will be gathered, conferences with parents, teachers and students will be annotated, class attendance records will be checked to determine how often children who are given options of whether

or not to attend class actually option not to.

An Independent Study questionnaire covering the major areas of Acceleration, Content, Resources and Evaluation plus a questionnaire on Change in Behavior and Relative Effects of Technique Compared to other Techniques including the areas of Learning--Content, Learning--Study Habits, Attitudes, and Social Interaction will be given to the group at the end of the school year to get an affective measure after one year of the program.

A questionnaire to the community covering the full expanse of the educational programs will be developed to aid in understanding what the community views as important for their children and to determine how much understanding they do have in regard to the educational provisions of the district.

The In-Service program for teachers will include a section devoted to evaluation as a "tool to understanding". They will be introduced to some of the basic skills of test construction and interpretation and will work on developing a rating scale or checklist for use in their classroom. The teachers will be introduced to self-assessment techniques such as Style of Teaching Inventory and Flanders Interaction Analysis. The Flanders will be used as a tool for noting changes in teacher-directed--student-directed behavior as the school year progresses. Half-hour segments will be collected once a week on a random basis. The school's psychologist and the director of research and testing for the district will be an integral part of this section of In-Service.

---

1. What important data is omitted from the proposal in regard to the control group?
    1. The selection procedure
    2. The activities they will pursue
    3. The identity of the control group
    4. The male-female composition of the control group

2. The teachers that were assigned to the various groups would have what kind of impact on the learning outcomes?
    1. None at all
    2. Some, depending on the teachers' orientation
    3. Much, especially if the teaching group is homogeneous
    4. Very much, especially if the teachers were randomly assigned

3. Assuming that the teachers were randomly assigned to the control and experimental groups, how could the director of the project best wipe out differneces?
    1. Matching intelligence
    2. Collecting data on teacher feelings toward the project
    3. In-service training
    4. Employing master teachers

4. What type of outcomes in the proposed study is most difficult to evaluate objectively?
    1. Study habits
    2. Attitudes
    3. Social interaction
    4, None of the above

5. If a positive correlation between self direction and Inquiry Training and Critical Thinking exists in the proposed study, we could assume that
    1. Self direction caused the outcome
    2. Critical thinking is dependent on self direction
    3. Some relationship exists between the two
    4. A relationship exists, but caution is advised in interpretation

6. In general, increasing the length of a test will make it more
    1. Valid
    2. Reliable
    3. Objective
    4. Diagnostic

7. Which of the following data could <u>not</u> have been collected by interviews?
    1. Goal achievement
    2. Attitudes of the parents
    3. Goal orientation
    4. Perceptions of the program

8. What statements can we safely make about the size of the samples in the various groups?
    1. Too small to make any sound conclusions regarding the outcomes
    2. Adequate if we are interested in verifying hunches
    3. Adequate if more control groups were included
    4. Adequate

9. What is the most dynamic aspect of the program proposal?
    1. The background
    2. The educational process
    3. The outcomes
    4. The standards

10. Would you say that the four program proposal objectives are stated as
    1. Explicit
    2. Implicit
    3. Cognitive
    4. Psychomotor

11. Do you consider the objectives
    1. Global
    2. Specific
    3. Behavioral
    4. Explicit

12. Which of the following is least appropriate for educational evaluation?
    1. Educational process studies
    2. Proficiency measures
    3. Attitude measures
    4. Cost studies

13. An on-going evaluation of an existing program, formative evaluation, usually encompasses all but one of the following activities. Identify the activity that is usually <u>not</u> used for feedback and revision of a continuous program.
    1. Observation of student activities
    2. Pre and post testing
    3. Study of the logical consistency between goals, students, content, method and outcomes
    4. Objective experimental comparison among programs

14. What do you consider to be a major weakness in the evaluation of the proposed study?
    1. No provision for continual assessment and goal or process revision
    2. The goals are not stated adequately
    3. Too many of the test instruments are of the home-made type
    4. The control groups are not adequately matched

15. When would motivation be a significant variable that could affect the outcomes of the program proposal?
    1. When it is applied to the control groups only
    2. When it is applied to the experimental group only
    3. When it is applied to both groups
    4. When it is applied to neither group

16. Why is the teachers' attitude an important antecedent condition to consider?
    1. It could easily influence the results
    2. It would provide for greater goal achievement
    3. It will determine what teachers will stay with the program
    4. It is not important to consider

17. In the proposal, what do the symbols $RO_1 \times O_2$

    $RO_1 \times O_2$ mean?
    1. That the control and experimental groups are matched in all respects except for an intervening variable x
    2. That both groups are quite dissimilar
    3. That the outcomes are expected to remain constant
    4. That a multiplier effect will operate with the experimental group

18. Would knowledge that they are participating in a research project have any effect on the students' performance?
    1. Most definitely
    2. Probably
    3. Certainly not
    4. Don't know

19. Would knowledge of the experimental nature by the control group only affect the outcome of the program?
    1. Yes, but don't know to what extent
    2. Yes, and to a great extent
    3. No, since this variable has been controlled
    4. No, since the experimental design controls this

20. Which aspect of the program proposal comes closest to being summative: i.e. evaluating the programs overall effectiveness?
    1. Matched groups
    2. Pre and post-test administration
    3. I.Q. test administration
    4. Reports from the students

21. Rational decisions about the program's comparative worth can best be determined by which of the following activities?
    1. Comparing the program against a traditional program
    2. Comparing the program's performance against a control group performance
    3. Comparing the performance of the experimental group with other schools
    4. Determining the cost of the program

22. Would I.Q. scores of the participants in the experimental program have some effect on their achievement of independence and self direction?
    1. Yes. Since the program has picked the top sixth of the class, the I.Q. must be related to this characteristic.
    2. Yes, because studies indicate a high correlation between intelligence and the hoped-for achievement characteristics.
    3. No, because the standard error of measurement at the upper levels of I.Q. tests are usually greater than those at the other levels.
    4. No, because the group is too heterogeneous to tell.

23. Which statement is most correct in regard to the size of the sample in the program proposal?
    1. The sample is too small for statistical inference
    2. The sample is adequate for statistical inference
    3. The t test would be an inadequate means of comparing the groups' performance
    4. Chi square would be a most adequate statistical test to use.

24. What is the real danger in collecting judgments about programs?
    1. They are unreliable
    2. They are subjective
    3. They become the criterion for judging a program
    4. They are usually tested against an outside criterion

25. Which of the following is the best criterion for judging the merits of a program?
    1. Standard
    2. Judgment
    3. Outcomes
    4. Cost

26. What statement would best defend the usage of the Lorge-Thorndike intelligence test in the program proposal?
    1. The test had been standardized on an adequate sample population
    2. The test is highly reliable
    3. The test correlates quite high with a valid individual intelligence test
    4. The test is predictive of independent study success

27. How would you describe the standards to judge the project proposal program's outcomes?
    1. They are relative
    2. They are absolute
    3. They are non existent
    4. They are different for the experimental and control groups

28. "As part of the developmental sequence of the program, the students' initial options will be very limited. The progress of each child in adjusting to these will determine the point at which additional options providing for greater independence will be introduced."

    How would you react to the above statement?
    1. Additional options will improve the design of the study
    2. Additional options will complicate the design and make control of the other variables quite difficult
    3. The amount of options can be correlated with the ten students' success in the control group
    4. The amount of options can be correlated with the achievement of the ten students in the experimental group to determine the causal impact of the options on achievement

29. Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval is to new produ ts as field testing is to _____.
    1. Matched design
    2. Instrument development
    3. Variable selection
    4. Group experiment

30. For what phase of the project proposal is it most important to have norm data?
    1. Rating scale development
    2. Checklist development
    3. Intelligence test selection
    4. Self assessment techniques selection

31. One of the intended outcomes of the program is stated as follows: Given the freedom in which to operate, the intellectually superior child will eventually become a more productive individual. How would you best measure the attainment of this outcome?
    1. By administering an independent study questionnaire
    2. By administering the Iowa Test of Basic Skills
    3. By providing appropriate experiences
    4. By observing youngsters

32. If the evaluator had to judge the contingency between the educational experiences and the outcome, what would be his best point of reference?
    1. Buros Mental Measurement Yearbook
    2. Encyclopedia of Educational Research
    3. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives
    4. Psychology Today

ITEMS 33-36 ARE TO BE ANSWERED TRUE OR FALSE--1 for true, 2 for false.

33. Educational evaluation is essentially the same as educational research in terms of techniques used and in terms of questions to be answered.

34. Questionnaire information is the least reliable and useful information evaluators collect.

35. The size of the samples, method of drawing it, and other features of the survey design will not be affected by the kind of analysis to be made of the results.

36. Archives might include examining science-teacher-of-the year candidates' careers.

37. Evaluative Criteria is to accreditation study as Campbell and Stanley's handbook is to _____.
    1. Rating scales
    2. Statistics
    3. Questionnaires
    4. Experimental research

38. The Chi square technique is commonly used for
    1. Describing groups in terms of fine measurement data
    2. Testing hypotheses regarding "fine measurement" data
    3. Describing groups in terms of frequency counts
    4. Testing hypotheses regarding frequency counts

39. The Q Technique and conventional factor analysis are both techniques for
    1. Analyzing profiles of students
    2. Clustering "like things" together
    3. Comparing large numbers of groups
    4. Evaluating instructional television

40. The process of generalizing from sample data to population conditions while at the same time specifying the investigators' confidence in drawing correct conclusions is known as
    1. Summative evaluation
    2. Interaction analyses
    3. Statistical inference
    4. Taking a calculated risk

41. Which of the following is usually <u>not</u> considered a major area of specialization for the educational research methodologist?
    1. Measurement, testing, instrumentation
    2. Research design, experimental controls
    3. Statistical description and inference
    4. Cost-benefit analysis, program evaluation

42. Test techniques are generally preferred to observational techniques, when both are available for the testing purposes, because the former are
    1. More apt to yield measures
    2. Perceived as a test by the student, thus more apt to be based on a motivated performance
    3. Applicable to a wider variety of personal traits
    4. More apt to yield reliable scores

43. Which of the following scores appearing in a student's record would be most meaningful without further reference to the group?
    1. 23 items correct in an English test of 40 items
    2. 30 items wrong in an algebra test of 50 items
    3. 100 words per minute in a typwriting test
    4. Omitted ten items in each of the English and algebra tests

44. Problems arise in attempting to develop measures of ultimate goals mainly because
    1. Measurement methods have not given proper weight to all goals
    2. Teachers have been reluctant to depart from traditional testing methods
    3. Group norms with which to compare results are not available
    4. Such goals concern behavior not usually observable under classroom conditions

45. In order to compute a correlation coefficient between traits A and B, it is necessary to have
    1. Measures of trait A on the group of persons, and of trait B on another
    2. One group of persons, some who have both A and B, some with neither and some with one but not the other
    3. Two groups of persons, one which could be classified as A or not A, the other as B or not B
    4. Measures of traits A and B on each person in one group

46. Test norms are most satisfactory when the sample of pupils or students used in establishing the norms
    1. Consists of nearly all pupils or students taking the test prior to the time the norms are published
    2. Is representative of a clearly defined population with which it is appropriate to make comparisons
    3. Ranges over all the grade levels in which the test is likely to be used
    4. Includes all schools volunteering to participate in the standardization testing

47. Outcomes include which of the following activities?
    1. In-service training of teachers
    2. Demonstration of not planned-for behavior
    3. Administration of a pre-test
    4. Preparation of goals

48. Is it possible to measure and observe the outcomes of the program proposal immediately after the school term is completed?
    1. Yes, because a delay will cause a reversal of behavior
    2. No, only a longitudional study can do this
    3. Yes, to a certain extent
    4. None of the above is correct

49. Why must unintended program outcomes also be carefully considered?
    1. They would illustrate the impact of the program
    2. They help define the nature of the program
    3. They should not be considered at all
    4. They could negate the effects of the desirable outcomes

50. What is the effect of the parents on selecting the options and determining the behavior of the program proposal participants?
    1. It is a variable to consider
    2. It would cause little effect
    3. Too many major variables have already been identified
    4. Parents would have little impact here

APPENDIX B: BACKGROUND INFORMATION FORM

The evaluation institute you will be attending in the near future is designed to help each of the participants achieve a high degree of mastery in the evaluation area. To accomplish this we must first have some information on your background so that the institute can be planned accordingly. Therefore, will you complete the following questionnaire and teturn it by the _____.

1. Name_____

2. What is your present job title? _____

3. How many years have you had this particular job?_____

4. How many years have you worked in the field of education? _____

5. If you are not a teacher, please describe your job. _____

_____

6. Highest educational degree received? _____

7. What was your major area of study in your graduate program? _____

_____

8. What has been your exposure to statistics at the college level?
   A. None
   B. Part of a course --i.e. educational psychology

      What course or courses? _____
   C. One full course
   D. More than one course

      How many? _____

9. When were the statistics courses taken?
   A. One year ago
   B. Two years ago
   C. Three years ago
   D. More than three years ago

10. How many tests and measurement courses have you taken?
   A. None
   B. Part of a course
   C. One full course
   D. More than one course

      How many? _____

11. Have you ever established goals for a program or worked on a committee doing so?
    A. Yes
    B. No
    C. Don't remember

12. Describe your experience with any phase of evaluation? _____

_____

13. When sampling behavior, do you feel more comfortable with
    A. Tests
    B. Observations

14. Do you regularly prepare objectives and statements of expected outcomes for your courses?
    A. Yes
    B. No

15. Do you feel the outcomes expected are more important than a consideration of the "raw material" going into the program--the students' background?
    A. Yes
    B. No
    C. Don't know

16. If you were asked to conduct an evaluation of a program in your school, how would you proceed? _____

_____

17. What other courses have you had that would help prepare you for evaluation? _____

_____

18. Whom might you ask to assist you in the evaluation of an educational program? _____

_____

19. Please list any books or articles (and authors, if possible) that you may have read in any of these areas:

    Tests and Measurement _____

    _____

    _____

    Educational Psychology _____

    _____

Statistics _____

_____

_____

Instructional Objectives _____

_____

_____

20. Following is a list of terms and phrases which are important to one undertaking a study of the role of the evaluator. Indicate your degree of understanding of each according to the following code:

CU Completely understand the item to a degree where it can be applied
SU Some understanding of the item

VU Vague understanding of the item
NU No understanding of the item

1. ____Achievement test
2. ____Alternate-form reliability
3. ____Aptitude
4. ____Arithmetic mean
5. ____Average
6. ____Battery
7. ____Behavioral change
8. ____Ceiling
9. ____Class interval
10. ____Coefficient of correlation
11. ____Correlation
12. ____Criterion
13. ____Cross-validation
14. ____Deviation
15. ____Diagnostic test
16. ____Difficulty value
17. ____Discriminating power
18. ____Distribution
19. ____Enabling objective
20. ____Equal interval scale
21. ____Equivalent form
22. ____Face validity
23. ____Factor analysis
24. ____Forced-choice item
25. ____Formation evaluation
26. ____Grade norm
27. ____Group test
28. ____Individual test

29. ____Input
30. ____Intelligence quotient
31. ____Inventory test
32. ____Item
33. ____Item analysis
34. ____Median
35. ____Mental age
36. ____Mode
37. ____Normal distribution
38. ____Norms
39. ____Objective test
40. ____Objectivity
41. ____Percentile rank
42. ____Percentile
43. ____Performance test
44. ____Personality test
45. ____Power test
46. ____Practice test
47. ____Profile
48. ____Prognostic test
49. ____Projective technique
50. ____Quartile
51. ____Random sample
52. ____Range
53. ____Rank order scale
54. ____Rating Scales
55. ____Rationale of the program
56. ____Raw score
57. ____Recall item
58. ____Reference population
59. ____Reliability
60. ____Reliability coefficient
61. ____Representative sample
62. ____Scale
63. ____Skewness
64. ____Speed test
65. ____Split-half coefficient
66. ____Standard deviation
67. ____Standard error
68. ____Standard error of measurement
69. ____Standard score
70. ____Standardized test
71. ____Stanine
72. ____Stratified sample
73. ____Summative evaluation
74. ____t-test
75. ____Test-retest coefficient
76. ____Transmutation of scores
77. ____True-false item
78. ____True score
79. ____Validity
80. ____Variability

APPENDIX C

Curriculum Components

Dear Staff Member:

I am attempting to discover the relationship between the curriculum conponents of last summer's evaluation institute held at Urbana and the planned-for outcomes.

Please read each objective and select the curriculum component that most helped meet that objective. The number of that component should be inserted in the box under the heading First. Then select the next most useful component and insert the number of the curriculum component under the Second heading. Finally, select the third curriculum component and insert it under the appropriate heading.

Proceed to the next objective. Thank you.

CURRICULUM COMPONENTS

1. Evaluation model
2. Videotapes
3. Individual work session
4. Group work session
5. Observation and testing
6. Resource material
7. Classroom observation
8. Textbook evaluation
9. Research design
10. Unobtrusive measures
11. Statistical problems
12. Role playing
13. Judgments
14. Panel on evaluation problems
15. Measuring cognitive outcomes
16. Questionnaire construction
17. Survey procedures
18. Test Development
19. Interview training
20. Scaling
21. Evaluation plan critique
22. Model plans
23. Develop model plan

CURRICULUM COMPONENTS
Order of Importance

	First	Second	Third
1. AFFECTIVE DOMAIN			
.1 To develop an awareness of the important contribution evaluation makes to the educational endeavor	1	3	4
.2 To accept the evaluator role as one which assists educators rather than hinders them.	3	4	12
.3 To want to assist in the further development of the field of educational evaluation.	23		

	CURRICULUM COMPONENTS Order of Importance		
	First	Second	Third
AFFECTIVE DOMAIN (continued)			
.4 To discuss evaluation and become more interested in the field.			
.5 To develop a climate among educators that is supportive of evaluation.	12		
.6 To assume a leadership role in the local educational setting.	12		
.7 To overcome any mental blocks against evaluation.	12		
.8 To enable the trainees to accept the ambivalent feeling.			
.9 To view evaluation as a helping kind of relationship in the educational process.			
.10 To develop a professional relationship with evaluation agencies on a local, state and federal level.			
.11 To try.			
2. STIMULUS DOMAIN			
.1 To encounter the logical arguments for gathering evaluation information to assist in the making of rational decisions in the local project.	1		
.2 To encounter an evaluation model around which the local evaluation efforts could be organized.	1		
.3 To encounter a discussion of evaluation problems featuring the viewpoints of experienced evaluators, researchers, and administrators.	4	2	
.4 To encounter a growing opportunity for sharing local project findings with staff members of other projects.			
.5 To encounter direction to an abundance of resources, personal and otherwise, to aid in the conduct of evaluation at the local level.	5 -20		
3. PERFORMANCE DOMAIN			
.1 To design components of an evaluation plan for local use.	22	23	
.2 To make a table of contents for a summative evaluation report of his own local gifted program.			

	CURRICULUM COMPONENTS Order of Importance		
	First	Second	Third
PERFORMANCE DOMAIN (continued)			
.3 To improve his facility for using the language and concepts of measurement and evaluation.	23		
.4 To prepare to try out certain standardized classroom observation techniques that can be useful in evaluation studies.	5		
.5 To examine prototype evaluation reports and read selections from the literature on evaluation.	6		
.6 To work out solutions to a series of problems designed to stimulate the conditions and circumstances of local gifted projects in Illinois.	22	23	

APPENDIX D

Staff or Faculty Component

Dear Staff Member:

This time I am going to present you with the same list of objectives as before, but instead of asking you to give the curriculum components that were of most importance in achieveing the objective, I would like you to select the three individuals, in order of importance, who contributed significantly to the attainment of the objective. Thanks again.

STAFF OR FACULTY COMPONENT

1. R. Cunningham
2. T. Denny
3. S. Feldman
4. S. Gotch
5. T. Hastings
6. E. House
7. T. Kerins
8. S. Lapan
9. R. Stake
10. D. Sjogren
11. G. Summers
12. B. Wilson

STAFF OR FACULTY COMPONENT
Order of Importance

	First	Second	Third
1. AFFECTIVE DOMAIN			
.1 To develop an awareness of the important contribution evaluation makes to the educational endeavor.	9	10	2
.2 To accept the evaluator role as one which assists educators rather than hinders them.	9	10	2
.3 To want to assist in the further development of the field of educational evaluation.	9	10	2
.4 To discuss evaluation and become more interested in the field.	9	10	2
.5 To develop a climate among educators that is supportive of evaluation	9	10	2
.6 To assume a leadership role in the local educational setting.	9	10	2
.7 To overcome any mental blocks against evaluation.	9	10	2
.8 To enable the trainees to accept the ambivalent feeling.	9	10	2
.9 To view evaluation as a helping kind of relationship in the educational process	9	10	2

	STAFF OR FACULTY COMPONENT Order of Importance		
	First	Second	Third
AFFECTIVE DOMAIN (continued)			
.10 To develop a professional relationship with evaluation agencies on a local, state and federal level	9	10	2
.11 To try.	9	10	2
2. STIMULUS DOMAIN			
.1 To encounter the logical arguments for gathering evaluation information to assist in the making of rational decisions in the local project.	9	10	2
.2 To encounter an evaluation model around which the local evaluation efforts could be organized.	9	10	2
.3 To encounter a discussion of evaluation problems featuring the viewpoints of experienced evaluators, researchers, and administrators.	9	10	2
.4 To encounter a growing opportunity for sharing local project findings with staff members of other projects.	9	10	2
.5 To encounter direction to an abundance of resources, personal and otherwise, to aid in the conduct of evaluation at the local level	9	10	2
3. PERFORMANCE DOMAIN			
.1 To design components of an evaluation plan for local use.	10	6	8
.2 To make a table of contents for a summative evaluation report of his own local gifted program.			
.3 To improve his facility for using the language and concepts of measurement and evaluation.	9	10	2
.4 To prepare to try out certain standardized classroom observation techniques that can be useful in evaluation studies.	2	9	
.5 To examine prototype evaluation reports and read selections from the literature on evaluation.			
.6 To work out solutions to a series of problems designed to stimulate the conditions and circumstances of local gifted projects in Illinois.	10	6	8

APPENDIX E

Evaluation Component

Dear Staff Member:

I am going to ask you to make one last examination of the objectives that were supported during the evaluation institute at Urbana. This time I would like to introduce the evaluation component and to have you determine which of the nine evaluation components listed were used to evaluate the objectives and to what extent those used did so. Use the following key and assign a letter to each objective below each of the evaluation components.

Key to be used:

E - Excellent	F - Fair
VG - Very Good	P - Poor
G - Good	NA - Not Applicable

Example: if the participant critique form did an excellent job of evaluating objective 1.1, place an E in the cell. If the Observer's report was only fair in evaluating the same objective, place an F in the appropriate cell. Thank you.

EVALUATION COMPONENT

1. Self Perception

   .1 Participant Critique Form

2. Staff Evaluation

   .1 Observer's Report
   .2 Evaluation Plan

3. Peer Evaluation

   .1 Participant Critique Form
   .2 Participant Interview Schedule
   .3 Role Playing

4. Comparative Evaluation

   .1 Achievement
   .2 Attitude
   .3 Opinionnaire

EVALUATION COMPONENT

	Participant Critique Form 1.1	Observer's Report 2.1	Evaluation Plans 2.2	Participant Critique Form 3.1	Participant Interview Schedule 3.2
1. AFFECTIVE DOMAIN					
.1 To develop an awareness of the important contribution evaluation makes to the educational endeavor.	E	G	NA	E	F
.2 To accept the evaluator role as one which assists educators rather than hinders them.	E	G	NA	E	F
.3 To want to assist in the further development of the field of educational evaluation.	E	G	NA	E	F
.4 To discuss evaluation and become more interested in the field	E	G	NA	E	F
.5 To develop a climate among educators that is supportive of evaluation.	E	G	NA	E	F
.6 To assume a leadership role in the local educational setting.	E	G	NA	E	F
.7 To overcome any mental blocks against evaluation.	E	G	NA	E	F
.8 To enable the trainees to accept the ambivalent feeling.	E	G	NA	E	F
.9 To view evaluation as a helping kind of relationship in the educational process	E	G	NA	E	F
.10 To develop a professional relationship with evaluation agencies on a local, state and federal level.	E	G	NA	E	F
.11 To try.	E	G	NA	E	F

EVALUATION COMPONENT

	Role Playing 3.3	Achievement Test 4.1	Attitude Survey 4.2	Opinionnaire 4.3
1. AFFECTIVE DOMAIN				
.1 To develop an awareness of the important contribution evaluation makes to the educational endeavor.	NA	NA	VG	E
.2 To accept the evaluator role as one which assists educators rather than hinders them.	NA	NA	VG	E
.3 To want to assist in the further development of the field of educational evaluation.	NA	NA	VG	E
.4 To discuss evaluation and become more interested in the field.	NA	NA	VG	E
.5 To develop a climate among educators that is supportive of evaluation.	NA	NA	VG	E
.6 To assume a leadership role in the local educational setting.	NA	NA	VG	E
.7 To overcome any mental blocks against evaluation.	NA	NA	VG	E
.8 To enable the trainees to accept the ambivalent feeling.	NA	NA	VG	E
.9 To view evaluation as a helping kind of relationship in the educational process.	NA	NA	VG	E
.10 To develop a professional relationship with evaluation agencies on a local, state and federal level.	NA	NA	VG	E
.11 To try.	NA	NA	VG	E

EVALUATION COMPONENT

	Participant Critique Form 1.1	Observer's Report 2.1	Evaluation Plans 2.2	Participant Critique Form 3.1	Participant Interview Schedule 3.2
2. STIMULUS DOMAIN					
.1 To encounter the logical arguments for gathering evaluation information to assist in the making of rational decisions in the local project.	VG	F	G	VG	F
.2 To encounter an evaluation model around which the local evaluation efforts could be organized	VG	F	G	VG	F
.3 To encounter a discussion of evaluation problems featuring the viewpoints of experienced evaluators, researchers, and administrators.		G			
.4 To encounter a growing opportunity for sharing local project findings with staff members of other projects.				G	F
.5 To encounter direction to an abundance of resources, personal and otherwise, to aid in the conduct of evaluation at the local level.	G	G			

EVALUATION COMPONENT

Role Playing 3.3	Achievement Test 4.1	Attitude Survey 4.1	Optinionnaire 4.3

2. STIMULUS DOMAIN

.1 To encounter the logical arguments for gathering evaluation information to assist in the making of rational decisions in the local project.	NA	G	F	VG
.2 To encounter an evaluation model around which the local evaluation efforts could be organized.	NA	G	F	VG
.3 To encounter a discussion of evaluation problems featuring the viewpoints of experienced evaluators, researchers, and administrators.	____	____	____	____
.4 To encounter a growing opportunity for sharing local project findings with staff members of other projects.	____	____	____	G
.5 To encounter direction to an abundance of resources, personal and otherwise, to aid in the conduct of evaluation at the local level.	____	____	____	____

	EVALUATION COMPONENT				
	Participant Critique Form 1.1	Observer's Report 2.1	Evaluation Plans 2.2	Participant Critique Form 3.1	Participant Interview Schedule 3.2
3. PERFORMANCE DOMAIN					
.1 To design components of an evaluation plan for local use.	____	____	VG	____	____
.2 To make a table of contents for a summative evaluation report of his own local gifted program.	____	____	____	____	____
.3 To improve his facility for using the language and concepts of measurement and evaluation.	____	____	VG	____	____
.4 To prepare to try out certain standardized classroom observation techniques that can be useful in evaluation studies.	____	____	____	____	____
.5 To examine prototype evaluation reports and read selections from the literature on evaluation.	____	G	____	____	____
.6 To work out solutions to a series of problems designed to stimulate the conditions and circumstances of local gifted projects in Illinois	____	____	VG	____	____

	EVALUATION COMPONENT			
	Role Playing 3.3	Achievement Test 4.1	Attitude Survey 4.2	Optinionnaire 4.3
3. PERFORMANCE DOMAIN				
.1 To design components of an evaluation plan for local use.	____	____	____	____
.2 To make a table of contents for a summative evaluation report of his own local gifted program.	____	____	____	____
.3 To improve his facility for using the language and concepts of measurement and evaluation.	____	____	____	____
.4 To prepare to try out certain standardized classroom observation techniques that can be useful in evaluation studies.	____	G	____	____
.5 To examine prototype evaluation reports and read selections from the literature on evaluation.	____	F	____	____
.6 To work out solutions to a series of problems designed to stimulate the conditions and circumstances of local gifted projects in Illinois.	____	F	F	____